

Comment on “Bicritical and Tetracritical Phenomena and Scaling Properties of the SO(5) Theory”

Recently, Hu [1] used Monte Carlo simulations on an SO(5) rotator model, and concluded that the multicritical point which characterizes the simultaneous ordering of the SO(3) “antiferromagnetic” (AF) 3-component and of the U(1) “superconducting” (SC) 2-component order parameters, $\vec{S}$ and $\vec{\Delta}$, has the critical behavior of the *isotropic* 5-component rotator model. This contradicts the order- ϵ renormalization group (RG) in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensions, which states that the isotropic SO(5) fixed point is unstable, and identifies this multicritical point with the anisotropic biconical fixed point [2,3]. Measurements of isotropic 5-component critical exponents at this multicritical point were proposed as “measuring the number 5, confirming the SO(5) theory for high- T_c superconductivity [4].

Without addressing the relevance of this discussion to high- T_c superconductivity (where one should also include fluctuations in the electromagnetic gauge field [5]), I show here that in fact, at $d = 3$ the multicritical point *must* be tetracritical, being characterized by the *decoupled* fixed point, at which the two order parameters are asymptotically independent. $\vec{S}$ and $\vec{\Delta}$ exhibit the Heisenberg ($n = 3$) and XY ($n = 2$) critical exponents even when they order simultaneously, and the two critical lines cross each other at finite angles. Accurate experiments in the asymptotic regime thus carry no information on the SO(5) theory.

The stability of the decoupled fixed point follows from an exact argument, which was already presented in 1976 [6,7]: at this point, the coupling term $|\vec{S}|^2|\vec{\Delta}|^2$ scales like the product of two energy-like operators, having the dimensions $(1 - \alpha_n)/\nu_n$, where α_n and ν_n are the specific heat and correlation length exponents. Thus, the combined operator has the dimension $d - \lambda$, where

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\alpha_2}{\nu_2} + \frac{\alpha_3}{\nu_3} \right) \quad (1)$$

is the scaling exponent which determines the RG flow of the coefficient of this term near the decoupled fixed point. The known negative values of α_2 and α_3 at $d = 3$ [8] then yield $\lambda \cong -0.087 < 0$, and the decoupled fixed point is stable, in contrast to the order- ϵ extrapolation to $\epsilon = 1$ [2,3].

Ref. [1] used a discrete spin model, with the constraint $|\vec{S}|^2 + |\vec{\Delta}|^2 = 1$. This is believed to be in the same universality class as a Ginzburg-Landau-Wilson (GLW) theory, with the quartic term $u(|\vec{S}|^2 + |\vec{\Delta}|^2)^2$ (where initially $u \rightarrow \infty$) [9]. Ref. [1] then added a coupling $w|\vec{S}|^2|\vec{\Delta}|^2$. Quantum fluctuations [10] and RG iterations [6] then also generate a term $v(|\vec{S}|^4 - |\vec{\Delta}|^4)$. Experience [3,6] yields six fixed points in the $u-v-w$ parameter space, of which

only one is stable. For a continuous transition, the above argument implies an RG flow away from the vicinity of the isotropic SO(5) unstable fixed point, at $v = w = 0$, to the decoupled one, where $2u + w = 0$. This flow may be slow, since the related exponents are small. Therefore, one might need to go very close to the tetracritical point in order to observe the correct critical behavior. The simulations of Ref. [1], which begin close to the isotropic fixed point ($u \gg v, w$) and use relatively small samples, probably stay in the transient regime which exhibits the isotropic exponents. To observe the true asymptotic decoupled behavior, one should start with a more general model, allowing different interactions for $\vec{S}$ and for $\vec{\Delta}$ and relaxing the strong constraint $|\vec{S}|^2 + |\vec{\Delta}|^2 = 1$.

Finally, note the different scaling behavior near the decoupled tetracritical point: the free energy breaks into a sum of the two free energies, and the asymptotic crossover exponent is $\varphi = 1$. However, there are also slowly decaying corrections, proportional to $w\xi^\lambda$, where ξ is some average correlation length. All the above statements assume that the initial Hamiltonian is the the region of attraction of the decoupled fixed point. Alternatively, one might expect a first order transition.

This work was supported by the German-Israeli Foundation (GIF).

Amnon Aharony

School of Physics and Astronomy, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel.

Received xxx

PACS numbers 74.20.-z, 05.70.Jk, 74.25.Dw

-
- [1] X. Hu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 057004 (2001).
 - [2] C. P. Burgess and C. A. Lütken, Phys. Rev. B **57**, 8642 (1998); S. Murakami and N. Nagaosa, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **69**, 2395 (2000).
 - [3] J. M. Kosterlitz, D. R. Nelson and M. E. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **13**, 412 (1976).
 - [4] S.-C. Zhang, Science **275**, 1089 (1997); J.-P. Hu and S.-C. Zhang, cond-mat/0005334 (unpublished).
 - [5] B. I. Halperin, T. C. Lubensky and S.-k. Ma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **32**, 292 (1974).
 - [6] A. Aharony, in “Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena”, (ed. C. Domb and M. Green), Vol. 6, p. 357 (Academic Press, New York, 1976).
 - [7] A. Aharony and S. Fishman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **37**, 1587 (1976).
 - [8] J. C. Le Guillou and J. Zinn-Justin, Phys. Rev. B **21**, 3976 (1980).
 - [9] K. G. Wilson and J. Kogut, Phys. Rep. **12C**, 78 (1974).
 - [10] E. Arrigoni and W. Hanke, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 11770 (2000).